REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection in view of the amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by *IBM*, "Websphere Application Server Enterprise Services Business Rule Beans (BRBeans)," 2001 (hereinafter *IBM*). The Examiner stated essentially that *IBM* teaches or suggests all of the limitations of Claims 1-33.

Claims 1, 24 and 33 are the independent claims.

Claims 1 and 33 claim, inter alia, "identifying inferencing aspects for a program; and providing the identified inferencing aspects as inferencing components, wherein the inferencing components are externalizable." Claim 24 claims, "an identification component configured to identify at least one point of variability within an application program; and an externalization component for providing the identified at least one point of variability with externalized business logic, the externalized business logic including an inferencing component."

IBM teaches externalized business rules (see page 32). IBM does not teach, "providing the identified inferencing aspects as inferencing components, wherein the inferencing components are externalizable," as claimed in Claims 1 and 33 nor "an externalization component for providing the identified at least one point of variability with externalized business logic, the externalized business logic including an inferencing component" as claimed in Claim 24. The externalized business rules of IBM adhere to externalization techniques, wherein logic and data are implemented for making classifications, for example, for checking whether a truck weight entered is valid (see IBM, page 33, point 1) (for a further discussion of externalization techniques

see page 7-8 of the present application – e.g., in the context of externalization, "rules" are not those usually associated with artificial intelligence community, but are rather ones used to make everyday "business" decisions). Thus, the externalized business rules of *IBM* are not analogous to inference components as claimed in Claims 1, 24 and 33. The externalized business rules of *IBM* are used for making classifications and do not include inference components. Inferencing derives new knowledge from rules and knowledge. Referring to the Examiner's suggestion that the operation of an IF/THEN statement is a modus ponens inference; a modus ponens inference may be written as:

IF X is true THEN Y is true.

X is true.

Therefore Y is true.

However, IBM teaches an entirely different IF/THEN statement, exemplified by:

IF a person is a senior citizen, THEN provide a 5% discount.

(see IBM page 2)

The IF/THEN statement of *IBM* is used in only classification and lacks an inference, e.g., the derivation of knowledge. Indeed, nowhere does *IBM* teach inferencing. Therefore, *IBM* fails to teach all the limitations of Claims 1, 24 and 33.

Claims 2-23 depend from Claim 1. Claims 25-32 depend from Claim 24. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 1 and 24. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims 34 and 35 depend from Claims 1 and 24, respectively. Claims 34 and 35 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 1 and 24. Claims 34 and 35 are believed to be allowable for additional reasons.

Claims 34 and 35 claim an inferencing component deriving knowledge. The classification

methods of the externalized business rules of IBM do not derive knowledge. Therefore, Claims

34 and 35 are believed to be allowable over IBM.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including Claims 1-35, is believed to be in

condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully

requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Nathaniel T. Wallace

Reg. No. 48,909

Attorney for Applicants

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC

130 Woodbury Road Woodbury, New York 11797 TEL: (516) 692-8888

FAX: (516) 692-8889

10